REMARKS

The following remarks are prepared in response to the Office Action mailed February 2, 2005. Claims 21-24 have been added. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application, after entry of this amendment. Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reexamination.

Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the specification lacks proper antecedent basis for the phrase "first, second and third openings and the passage provide a substantially uniform stiffness along any lateral axis" as recited in claim 20.

Applicant asserts that the specification does provide antecedent basis for the phrase recited in claim 20. Applicant directs the Examiner to figure 4 and paragraph 26 which states: "The openings 214 and the passageways 216 may have any shape, size and configuration that produces a symmetrical design and maintains a uniform stiffness along any lateral axis." Furthermore, Applicant directs the Examiner to paragraph 8 which states: "The isolator may also include first, second and third openings spaced an equiangular distance (for example, 90 degrees or 120 degrees) apart from each other on the outer surface and a passage connecting the first, second and third openings." Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the specification.

Objection to Claim 19

Claim 19 is objected to because the phrase "in cylindrical" should be changed to "is cylindrical."

Applicant has amended claim 19 to remove the phrase "in cylindrical." Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claim 19.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Claims 5-8 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the phrase "the first axis" in line 1 and "the second axis" in line 2 lack proper antecedent basis. Also, the Examiner alleges that the phrase "the cylindrical body" first claimed in line 1 of claim 6 lacks proper antecedent basis.

Applicant has amended claims 5-8 to correct the antecedent basis problems. Therefore, the rejection of claims 5-8 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has failed to specifically identify the deficiencies of claims 10-14. Applicant asserts that claims 10-14 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention and therefore the rejection of claims 10-14 should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Schubert et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,660,255, hereinafter *Schubert*). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable of *Schubert.*

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a multi-axis shock and vibration isolator including a body having a top end and a bottom end, the body made of an elastomeric material for attenuating vibration at a first frequency along a vertical axis that passes through the top and bottom ends and first and second holes being sized and shaped for attenuating vibration at a second frequency along a lateral axis. Claim 10 has been amended in a similar manner.

Schubert does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements as recited in independent claims 1 and 10. *Schubert* discloses a compensation circuit 24 for measuring absolute velocity for one direction of motion (col. 12, lns. 35-40). *Schubert* also discloses that the compensation circuit 24 is replicated for each of the different directions of vibration (col. 12, lns. 40-43). Each compensation circuit 24 is limited to compensating in only one direction of vibration. Therefore, *Schubert* requires multiple compensation circuits to provide compensation in multiple directions as opposed to a single isolation device having a body for attenuating vibration at a first frequency along a vertical axis and holes for attenuating vibration at a second frequency along a lateral axis as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 includes an isolator that can provide attenuation at two different frequencies along two different axes using a single device. *Schubert* teaches away from the multi-axis shock and vibration isolator as recited in claim 1 because *Schubert* requires a circuit to provide compensation and therefore is not helpful in reaching the results achieved by claim 1, which is to provide a multi-axis shock and vibration isolator that uses the body to attenuate vibration at a first frequency along a vertical axis and the holes to attenuate vibration at a second frequency along a lateral axis. Accordingly, *Schubert* is devoid of any disclosure, teaching or suggestion at all of a multi-axis shock and vibration isolator as recited in claims 1 and 10. Therefore, the rejection of independent claims 1 and 10 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 11-14 depend from independent claim 10. All of these dependent claims define the isolator with greater particularity and thus further distinguish over *Schubert* and the other references of record. For this reason, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 10, the rejections of these dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schubert* in view of *Noble* (U.S. Patent No. 4,326,693, hereinafter *Noble*).

Claim 15 has been amended to recite a multi-axis shock and vibration isolator including a plus sign shaped through-hole connecting the first, second, third and fourth holes. The "through-hole" can be defined as a hollowed-out opening. The plus sign shaped through-hole 216a, 216b is shown in figure 3. Neither *Schubert* nor *Noble* disclose, teach or suggest a plus sign shaped through-hole for connecting the first, second, third and fourth holes. *Schubert* is directed to a cylindrical case 602 defining a cavity 604 where the case 602 has four bores 656 (col. 21, lns. 44-49, figure 10). Force caps 646 are positioned within the bores 656. *Noble* is directed to a holder for a relay 1 (col. 2, lns. 44-46, figure 2). Neither of these references disclose, teach or suggest a plus sign shaped through-hole for connecting the first, second, third and fourth holes. Accordingly, *Schubert* and *Noble* are devoid of any disclosure, teaching or suggestion at all of a multi-axis shock and vibration isolator including a plus sign shaped through-hole connecting the first, second, third and fourth holes. Therefore, the rejection of independent claim 15 should be withdrawn.

Claims 16-20 all depend from independent claim 15. All of these dependent claims define the multi-axis shock and vibration isolator with greater particularity and thus further distinguish over *Schubert*, *Noble* and the other references of record. For this reason, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 15, the rejection of these dependent claims should be withdrawn.

New Claims 21-24

Claim 21 recites, among other things, a tunable shock and vibration isolator including "a body of an elastomeric material for attenuating a first frequency of vibration in a longitudinal direction and a plurality of holes symmetrically oriented in the body for attenuating a second frequency of vibration in a lateral direction." The elements recited in claim 21 are similar to the elements recited in claims 1 and 10. For the reasons discussed above, as well as others, claim 21 should be allowable.

Claims 22-24 depend from independent claim 21. All of these dependent claims define the tunable shock and vibration isolator with greater particularity and thus further distinguish over *Schubert*, *Noble* and the other references of record. For this reason, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 21, claims 22-24 should be allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview will help further the prosecution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the listed telephone number.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on June 2, 2005.

By: Margaret M. Hasson

Signature

Dated: June 2, 2005

Very truly yours,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

Ketan S Vakil

Ketan S. Vakil
Registration No. 43,215
1920 Main Street, Suite 1200
Irvine, California 92614-7230
Telephone: (949) 253-4905